A tale of two velocities: Threading vs Slicing

R. Gharechahi [(a)] *, M. Nouri-Zonoz [(a)]† and A. Tavanfar [(b)] ‡

(a): Department of Physics, University of Tehran,

North Karegar Ave., Tehran 14395-547, Iran.

(b): International Institute of Physics,

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, 59078-400 Natal-RN, Brazil.

arXiv:1510.02359v3 [gr-qc] 9 Dec 2015

Abstract

Two different definitions of a 3-velocity assigned to a test particle following timelike geodesics in stationary spacetimes are introduced and analyzed. These definitions are based on the $1+3$ (threading) and $3+1$ (slicing) spacetime decomposition formalisms and defined relative to different sets of observers. To exemplify their differences, these are then calculated for a particle with a circular orbit in axially symmetric stationary spacetimes. Illustrating its geometric nature, the relative linear velocity between the corresponding observers is obtained in terms of the metric components. The Kerr spacetime as the prototype and the most well known of stationary spacetimes, often used to model rotating astrophysical objects, was examined with respect to these definitions to highlight their differences.

* Electronic address: r.gharechahi@ut.ac.ir

† Electronic address: nouri@ut.ac.ir, corresponding author

‡ Electronic address: alireza.tavanfar@cern.ch

I. INTRODUCTION AND MOTIVATION

In astrophysics and cosmology, one of the important observable quantities that one deals with is the 3-velocity of an object. As long as this is dealt with in the realm of Newtonian theory or in special relativity, the usual *flat* spacetime definitions are employed which we will call *coordinate time velocity*. But when it comes to the definitions and measurements of velocity in curved spacetime and in the context of general relativity (GR) then one has to choose a decomposition scheme to introduce spatial and temporal distances and accordingly define a 3-velocity. The famous example incorporating 3-velocities is the rotation curves of disk galaxies which present strong evidence for the existence of the so called dark matter. These are plots of the magnitude of the orbital velocity of visible matter in the galaxies (or clusters of galaxies) versus radial distance from the galactic (cluster) center. Another intersting example includes orbital velocities of particles moving in circular orbits around rotating black hole candidates, such as in the case of accretion disks around black holes produced by the material falling into the black hole from its companion star in black hole-star binaries . Although in the first example people mostly use the usual Newtonian definition of a 3-velocity [15], in the second example one has to employ GR-based calculations to account for the strong gravitational field of black holes. To assign 3-velocities to objects in curved backgrounds, we need to define spatial distances and time intervals between two nearby events in the underlying curved spacetime. Indeed the main idea of any splitting formalism in GR is the introduction of spatial and temporal sections of a spacetime metric so that one could assign spatial distances and time intervals to nearby events. There are two well-known decomposition formalisms namely : I- $3+1$ (or slicing formalism) and II- $1+3$ (or threading formalism). In the more famous $3+1$ splitting, the spacetime manifold is foliated into constant-time hypersurfaces and the spacetime metric is written in terms of the so called lapse function and shift vector [1]. On the other hand in the $1+3$ formulation of spacetime decomposition the propagation of light signals between any two nearby points is employed to express the spacetime metric in terms of the so called *synchronized proper time* interval and spatial distance [2, 3]. In what follows we restrict our attention to stationary spacetimes, noting that the two formalisms coincide for static spacetimes. These two different splitting methods lead to two different definitions of 3-velocities as measured relative to two different sets of observers. Now there are two questions in order 1- Whether or not and how these

two definitions are related? and 2- What are their main differences specially when applied to test particles in astrophysically relevant case of axially symmetric spacetimes such as the Kerr metric?. To simplify things we restrict our study to particles in circular orbits in axially symmetric stationary spacetimes, noting that most intersting cases including the above mentioned examples fall into this category. The outline of the paper is as follows. In sections II and III we introduce definitions of 3-velocity in the threading and slicing formalisms respectively and show that they are defined relative to different sets of observers. In section IV after comparing these definitions and obtaining their relation we calculate them in different stationary spacetimes including those of a rotating frame (as a pedagogical case) and also in Kerr and Kerr-NUT spacetimes. We summarize and discuss our results in the last section.

Notations: Following Landau and Lifshitz [2] our convention for indices is such that the Latin indices run from 0 to 3 while the Greek ones run from 1 to 3. Throughout we employ gravitational units in which $c = G = 1$ and indices T and S stand for threading and slicing respectively.

II. DEFINITION OF 3-VELOCITY IN 1+3 SPLITTING (THREADING) FORMALISM

In the $1 + 3$ formulation of spacetime decomposition, the *fundamental observers* in a gravitational field are those fixed at spatial points so that their world lines, acting as the time lines, thread the underlying spacetime (hence the name threading is justified). For these observers the local *space* is the subspace orthogonal to their worldlines at each instant of the coordinate (world) time x^0 [4, 5] and so they carry their 3-spaces with themselves. In this approach the basic idea is that even for stationary spacetimes one can not simply set $dx^0 = 0$ to find the spatial hypersurface over which the spatial distances are defined. This is so because in stationary spacetimes the cross terms mix the space and time coordinates in the form $dx^0 dx^\alpha$ (such as in Kerr spacetime) and setting $dx^0 = 0$ will obviously kill the contribution of dx^α as well. In this formalism it is the light signal propagation which is employed to characterize spatial distances measured by observers at fixed spatial coordinates separated by infinitesimal increments [2]. The spacetime metric in this formalism is expressed

in the following general form:

$$ds^2 = d\tau_{syn}^2 - {dl_T}^2 = g_{00}(dx^0 - g_\alpha dx^\alpha)^2 - \gamma_{T\alpha\beta}dx^\alpha dx^\beta \tag{1}$$

where $g_\alpha = -\frac{g_{0\alpha}}{g_{00}}$ and

$$\gamma_{T\alpha\beta} = -g_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{g_{0\alpha}g_{0\beta}}{g_{00}} \;\; ; \;\; {\gamma_T}^{\alpha\beta} = -g^{\alpha\beta} \tag{2}$$

is the spatial metric of a 3-space, on which dl_T gives the infinitesimal spatial distance between any two nearby events. Also $d\tau_{syn} = \frac{1}{c}\sqrt{g_{00}}(dx^0 - g_\alpha dx^\alpha)$ gives the infinitesimal interval of the so called *synchronized proper time* between any two events. In other words any two simultaneous events have a world-time difference of $dx^0 = g_\alpha dx^\alpha$. In the threading formalism, the 3-velocity for a particle is defined in terms of the synchronized proper time read by clocks synchronized along the particle's trajectory. The origin of this definition of a time interval could be explained through the following procedure. If the particle departs from point A (with coordinate x^α) at the moment of world time x^0 and arrives at the infinitesimally distant point B (with coordinate $x^\alpha + dx^\alpha$) at the moment $x^0 + dx^0$ then to determine the velocity we must now take, difference between $x^0 + dx^0$ and the moment $x^0 - \frac{g_{0\alpha}}{g_{00}}dx^\alpha$ which is *simultaneous* at the point B with the moment x^0 at the point A (Fig. 1). This time difference amounts to the synchronized proper time between the two nearby events and upon dividing the infinitesimal spatial coordinate interval dx^α by this time difference the 3-velocity of a particle in the underlying spacetime is given by [2]

$$(v_T)^\alpha = \frac{dx^\alpha}{d\tau_{syn}} = \frac{cdx^\alpha}{\sqrt{g_{00}}(dx^0 - g_\alpha dx^\alpha)} \tag{3}$$

Obviously in the Newtonian limit (i.e when $g_{00} \approx 1 + 2\Phi$ and $g_{0\alpha} = 0$ with Φ the gravitational potential and solution to the Poisson equation) the above definition reduces to the coordinate time velocity defined by $v^\alpha = \frac{dx^\alpha}{dx^0}$. Also we can write stationary spacetime metric in the following general form,

$$ds^2 = g_{00}(x^\alpha)(dx^0)^2 + 2g_{0\alpha}(x^\beta)dx^0dx^\alpha + g_{\alpha\beta}(x^\gamma)dx^\alpha dx^\beta \tag{4}$$

so that the square of the 3-velocity is then given by,

$$(v_T)^2 = (\frac{dl_T}{d\tau_{syn}})^2 = \gamma_{T\alpha\beta}{v_T}^\alpha {v_T}^\beta = \frac{(g_{0\alpha}dx^\alpha)^2 - g_{00}g_{\alpha\beta}dx^\alpha dx^\beta}{(g_{00}dx^0 + g_{0\alpha}dx^\alpha)^2}. \tag{5}$$

For later comparison we note that using (1) and the above definition, the interval ds could be expressed in terms of the velocity in the following form:

$$ds^2 = g_{00}(dx^0 + \frac{g_{0\alpha}}{g_{00}}dx^\alpha)^2[1 - {v_T}^2] = d\tau_{syn.}(1 - {v_T}^2) \tag{6}$$



FIG. 1: Threading formulation of spacetime decomposition and the 3-velocity of a test particle crossing two nearby worldlines of two fundamental observers. It is defined in terms of the proper time read by clocks synchronized along the particle's worldline by sending and receiving light signals.

Restricting our attention to the case of axially symmetric stationary spacetimes in cylindrical coordinates (t, r, z, ϕ) with the following general form,

$$ds^2 = g_{tt}(r,z)(dt)^2 + 2g_{t\phi}(r,z)dtd\phi + g_{\alpha\beta}(r,z)dx^\alpha dx^\beta \quad ; \quad \alpha,\beta = r,z,\phi \tag{7}$$

we also confine the motion of the particle to a circular orbit around the axis at $z = constant$ hypersurface such that the only nonvanishing component of the 3-velocity has the following form

$$({v_T}^\phi)^2 = \frac{g_{t\phi}^2 - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}}{\left(g_{tt} + g_{t\phi}(\frac{d\phi}{dt})\right)^2}\omega^2. \tag{8}$$

where $\omega = \frac{d\phi}{dt}$ is the *coordinate* angular velocity of the particle. As pointed out earlier, in the Newtonian limit it reduces to the expected result ${v_T}^2 \approx -g_{\phi\phi}(\frac{d\phi}{dt})^2 \equiv r^2\omega^2$.

III. DEFINITION OF 3-VELOCITY IN THE 3+1 SPLITTING (SLICING) FORMALISM

In the $3+1$ splitting, the spacetime manifold is foliated into constant-time hypersurfaces Σ_t and the (stationary) spacetime metric is written in terms of the so called lapse function $N(x^\alpha)$ and shift vector $N^\beta(x^\alpha)$ in the following form [1];

$$ds^2 = g_{ab}dx^a dx^b = (N^2 - N^\alpha N_\alpha)dx^{0^2} - 2N_\alpha dx^0 dx^\alpha - \gamma_{S\alpha\beta}dx^\alpha dx^\beta \tag{9}$$

in which

$$\gamma_{S\alpha\beta} = -g_{\alpha\beta} \;\; ; \;\; \gamma_S{}^{\alpha\beta} = -g^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{g^{0\alpha}g^{0\beta}}{g^{00}} \tag{10}$$

are the $3+1$ counterparts of (2) and

$$N_\alpha = -g_{0\alpha} \quad ; \quad N^2 = \frac{1}{g^{00}} \tag{11}$$

are the shift vector and lapse function respectively. It is also noted that the lapse function N measures proper time between two neighboring spacelike hypersurfaces $d\tau^2 = N^2(x^\alpha)dx^{0^2}$ while the shift vector relates spatial coordinates between them

$$dx^\alpha = x^\alpha_{x^0+\delta x^0} - x^\alpha_{x^0} = -N^\alpha(x^\alpha)dx^0$$

Now the above metric could also be written in the following illuminating form

$$ds^2 = d\tau^2 - dl_S{}^2 = N^2 dx^{0^2} - \gamma_{S\alpha\beta}(dx^\alpha + N^\alpha dx^0)(dx^\beta + N^\beta dx^0) \tag{12}$$

showing that spatial distances over the spacelike hypersurfaces Σ_t are given by

$$dl_S{}^2 = \gamma_{S\alpha\beta}(dx^\alpha + N^\alpha dx^0)(dx^\beta + N^\beta dx^0). \tag{13}$$

Also it should be noted that the indices of 3-vectors such as the shift vector N^α are raised and lowered by the same spatial metric $\gamma_{S\alpha\beta}$.

In this formalism for a particle with 4-velocity u^a, its 3-velocity v^μ is defined as the projection of the particle's 4-velocity onto the above mentioned spatial slices with respect to a time coordinate reference. To this end the timelike and future-directed unit vectors normal to the slicing hypersurfaces (denoted by n^a) are taken as the 4-velocity of the so called *Eulerian observers* [16], relative to whom the 3-velocity is defined as follows

$$v_S{}^\alpha = \frac{dl_S{}^\alpha}{d\tau} \tag{14}$$



FIG. 2: Spacetime decomposition in the slicing formalism in terms of the lapse function and shift vector. Proper time and the differential element of spatial distance used in the definition of the 3-velocity are also shown.

in which the norm of the displacement vector $d\mathbf{l}_S$ measures the distance between two spatial positions of the particle on the two hypersurfaces Σ_t and Σ_{t+dt} relative to the Eulerian observer. In the same way $d\tau$ measures the proper time on the Eulerian observer's worldline corresponding to the proper time measured on the particles worldline crossing the same hypersurfaces [17]. In this way v is tangent to the hypersurface Σ_t (Fig.2). In other words, from the Eulerian observers' point of view, the hypersurfaces Σ_t, are the set of all simultaneous events [6].

One can show that the 3-velocity, in terms of the coordinate-time velocity, could be written in the following form [6, 7]

$$v_S{}^{\alpha} = \frac{1}{N}(\frac{dx^{\alpha}}{dt} + N^{\alpha}) \tag{15}$$

and its square, in terms of the four dimensional metric components, is given by

$$(v_S)^2 = \gamma_{S_{\alpha\beta}} v_S{}^{\alpha} v_S{}^{\beta} = g_{\alpha\beta}\frac{dx^{\beta}}{dx^0}\left(2g^{0\alpha} - g^{00}\frac{dx^{\alpha}}{dx^0}\right) + g_{0\beta}g^{0\beta} \tag{16}$$

in which we used (10). Indeed (15) using one can express the metric (12) in the following equivalent form

$$ds^2 = N^2 dx^{0^2} - dl_S{}^2 = d\tau^2(1 - v_S^2) \tag{17}$$

which is obviously the $3+1$ counterpart of (6). Again restricting our attention to the case of axially symmetric stationary spacetimes we use the definitions of lapse function and shift vector to write the line element in its general form (7) as follows

$$ds^2 = \left(g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi} - g_{t\phi}^2\right) dt^2 + g_{\phi\phi}\left(d\phi + \frac{g_{t\phi}}{g_{\phi\phi}}dt\right)^2 + g_{rr}dr^2 + g_{zz}dz^2. \tag{18}$$

Restrictring the motion of the particle to a circular orbit at $z = constant$ hypersurface and using the definition of 3-velocity we end up with

$$(v_S)_\phi^2 = \frac{g_{\phi\phi}^2}{g_{t\phi}^2 - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}}(\omega + \frac{g_{t\phi}}{g_{\phi\phi}})^2 \tag{19}$$

where, as in the previous section, $\omega = \frac{d\phi}{dt}$ is the only nonzero component of the *coordinate* 3-velocity.

Now having these two different values for the norm of the 3-velocity of a particle in circular motion in stationary, axially symmetric spacetimes we can compare them in different backgrounds. This will be done in the next section.

IV. COMPARING THE TWO APPROACHES IN AXIALLY SYMMETRIC STATIONARY SPACETIMES

To sum up the discussions in the last two sections, one can say that in the threading formalism it is the *fundamental observers* who choose/define what should be the *local* space, whereas in the slicing formalism it is the slicing subspaces (spacelike hypersurfaces) which choose/define the corresponding *Eulerian observers*, also called fiducial observers for the obvious reason [18]. This way of explaining the difference between the two formalisms actually highlights the important role of the observers in both the definition and measurement of the spatio-temporal quantities such as the 3-velocity of a particle in a gravitational field discussed in the previous sections. Indeed this is mathematically reflected in the following two metric forms in the two formalisms

$$ds_T^2 = g_{00}{dx_T^0}^2 - \gamma_{T\alpha\beta}dx^\alpha dx^\beta = g_{00}(dx^0 + \frac{g_{0\alpha}}{g_{00}}dx^\alpha)^2 + (g_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{g_{0\alpha}g_{0\beta}}{g_{00}})dx^\alpha dx^\beta \tag{20}$$

and

$$ds_S^2 = g_{00S}{dx^0}^2 + g_{\alpha\beta}dx_S^\alpha dx_S^\beta = (g_{00} - N^\alpha N_\alpha){dx^0}^2 + g_{\alpha\beta}(dx^\alpha + N^\alpha dx^0)(dx^\beta + N^\beta dx^0). \tag{21}$$

In the $1+3$ form the cross terms are absorbed to define a new coordinate time difference $dx^0_T = dx^0 + \frac{g_{0\alpha}}{g_{00}}dx^\alpha$ and a quadratic term of temporal nature (i.e *the synchronized proper time*) by using the old time-time component of the metric(i.e g_{00}). On the other hand the same terms are borrowed to define a spatial metric $\gamma_{T\alpha\beta}$ and spatial distance using the old spatial coordinate differences, namely dx^α.

In the $3+1$ form the cross terms are absorbed to define a new time-time component of the metric $g_{00\,S} = g_{00} - N^\alpha N_\alpha$ and the proper time by using the old coordinate time difference, namely dx^0. On the other hand the same terms are also borrowed to define a new spatial coordinate difference $dx^\alpha_S = dx^\alpha + \frac{g^{0\alpha}}{g^{00}}dx^0$ and the spatial distance using the old space-space components of the metric, namely $g_{\alpha\beta}$. By the same token it is obvious that in the static spacetimes (i.e when $g_{0\alpha} = 0$) the two sets of observers coincide and both formalisms arrive at the same result which in the case of axially symmetric, stationary spacetimes is

$$(v_S)^2 = (v_T)^2 = -\frac{g_{\phi\phi}}{g_{tt}}\omega^2 \tag{22}$$

In what follows using the two formalisms and their values for the squared velocity of a particle in a circular orbit, namely Eqs. (8) and (19), we compare the results in different curved backgrounds. The fact that the two definitions introduced are relative to two different sets of observers and consequently should lead to different values is more highlighted when one considers the case of a particle with $\omega \equiv \frac{d\phi}{dt} = 0$ i.e a particle with zero coordinate velocity. In this case it is noted that equations (8) and (19) reduce to

$$v_T = 0 \quad ; \quad (v_S)^2_\phi = \frac{g^2_{t\phi}}{g^2_{t\phi} - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}} \tag{23}$$

the first of which is expected intuitively since relative to a fundamental observer, by its definition, another fundamental observer's velocity (treated as a test particle with zero *coordinate velocity*) is zero.

On the other hand if we take $\omega = -\frac{g_{t\phi}}{g_{\phi\phi}}$ i.e for a particle moving with the spacetime fluid (dragged by the geometry) then

$$v_S = 0 \quad ; \quad (v_T)^2_\phi = \frac{g^2_{t\phi}}{g^2_{t\phi} - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}}. \tag{24}$$

Again the first result is expected intuitively since a particle moving with a coordinate velocity equal to the dragging angular velocity should be at rest relative to the (Eulerian) observer which is comoving with the spacetime fluid having the same angular velocity. In other words

an observer attached to this particle is an Eulerian observer.

The above result is an interesting one showing that the fundamental observers and Eulerian observers which move relative to each other with the dragging *angular velocity* $\omega = -\frac{g_{t\phi}}{g_{\phi\phi}}$ have the relative *linear velocity* whose magnitude is given by,

$$(u_{TS})_\phi = \frac{|g_{t\phi}|}{\sqrt{g_{t\phi}^2 - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}}}. \tag{25}$$

Since both the fundamental and Eulerian observers are local, the above assertion could be proved simply by applying the relativistic velocity addition in the following form,

$$v_T = \frac{u_{TS} + v_S}{1 + u_{TS}v_S}, \tag{26}$$

in which v_T and v_S are the threading and slicing 3-velocities. It is an easy task to check that Eqs (8) and (19) satisfy the above relation with $u_{TS} = -\frac{|g_{t\phi}|}{\sqrt{g_{t\phi}^2 - g_{tt}g_{\phi\phi}}}$ [19] as the relative linear velocity between the two observers (frames). The above results and their interpretations become more clear when we consider explicit examples in what follows.

A. Spacetime metric in a uniformly rotating frame

As a first, perhaps trivial but also pedagogical example, we consider the stationary gravitational field of a uniformly rotating frame in cylindrical coordinates with constant angular velocity Ω about its z-axis. Using the Gallilian rotational transformation in cylindrical coordinates, spacetime metric in such a frame is given by,

$$ds^2 = (1 - \Omega^2 r^2)dt^2 - 2\Omega r^2 dt d\phi - dr^2 - r^2 d\phi^2 - dz^2 \tag{27}$$

which could obviously be used only up to radial coordinates less than $r = \frac{1}{\Omega}$, beyond which $ds^2 < 0$ [2, 8]. Now substituting components of the above metric in the two 3-velocity definitions, we arrive at the following results

$${v_T}^2 = \frac{r^2\omega^2}{\left(1 - r^2\omega^2(\frac{\Omega}{\omega} + \frac{\Omega^2}{\omega^2})\right)^2} \quad ; \quad {v_S}^2 = r^2\omega^2(1 + \frac{\Omega}{\omega})^2. \tag{28}$$

For $\Omega = 0$ both reduce to the expected result namely $v_T = v_S = r\omega$. Also, compatible with equations (23) and (24), for a particle with zero coordinate velocity,

$$v_T = 0 \quad ; \quad v_S = -r\Omega \tag{29}$$



FIG. 3: Slicing 3-velocity (dashed line) and threading 3-velocity (solid line) of particles in circular orbit in the spacetime of a uniformly rotating frame with $\frac{\Omega}{\omega} = 2$ in terms of the orbit's radial coordinate.

and for a particle with the coordinate velocity $\omega = -\frac{g_{t\phi}}{g_{\phi\phi}} = -\Omega$,

$$v_S = 0 \quad ; \quad v_T = r\Omega. \tag{30}$$

This simple example should be a guide for us in interpreting the two velocities assigned to test particles when we treat stationary gravitational fields produced by matter distributions such as Kerr metric which we discuss next.

B. Kerr spacetime

Rotating stars and rotating black holes are among the most important objects in the forefront of the astrophysical observation and so any observable quantity related directly and indirectly to the rotation parameter of these objects is also of utmost importance. The spacetime metric around such sources is modeled by the Kerr metric which represents the axially symmetric, stationary spacetime around a rotating spherical source. It has the following form in the Boyer-Lindquist coordinates,

$$ds^2 = (1-\frac{2Mr}{\rho^2})dt^2+\frac{4Mar\sin^2\theta}{\rho^2}dtd\phi-\frac{\rho^2}{\Delta}dr^2-\rho^2d\theta^2-(r^2+a^2+\frac{2Ma^2r\sin^2\theta}{\rho^2})\sin^2\theta d\phi^2 \tag{31}$$

where

$$\rho^2 = r^2 + a^2\cos^2\theta \quad , \quad \Delta = r^2 - 2Mr + a^2 \tag{32}$$

Here we restrict our attention to the motions of the particles in the equatorial plane ($\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$) for which the spacetime metric is given by,

$$ds^2(\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}) = (1 - \frac{2M}{r})dt^2 + \frac{4Ma}{r}dtd\phi - (r^2 + a^2 + \frac{2Ma^2}{r})d\phi^2 - \frac{r^2}{\Delta}dr^2. \qquad (33)$$

In this special case the timelike and null geodesics in the Kerr geometry are described by two constants of motion which correspond to the total energy and angular momentum along the symmetry axis [9, 10]. We further restrict our attention to the circular orbits which observationally constitute an important class of orbits in this spacetime specially in the study of accretion disks around rotating black holes.

In the case of Kerr metric the two sets of fundamental observers and Eulerian observers are called *Zero Angular Velocity Observers* (or ZAVOs) and *Zero Angular Momentum Observers* (or ZAMOs) respectively. These two sets of observers and their frames rotate with respect to each other with the angular velocity $-g_{t\phi}/g_{\phi\phi}$ [13]. In this case for test particles on circular orbits (as timelike geodesics), the coordinate angular velocity as the only non-vanishing coordinate velocity component is given by

$$\Omega \equiv \frac{d\phi}{dt} = \mp\frac{M^{1/2}}{r^{3/2} \mp aM^{1/2}}, \qquad (34)$$

where the upper sign refers to retrograde (counterrotating) orbits while the lower one refers to the direct (corotating) orbits. This quantity is also called Keplerian angular velocity [13]. Circular orbits exist in the region $r > r_{ph}$, with r_{ph} denoting the radial coordinate of the innermost boundary of the timelike circular orbits, the so called *circular photon orbit* [10],

$$r_{ph} = 2M\left\{1 + \cos\left[\frac{2}{3}arc\cos\left(\pm\frac{a}{M}\right)\right]\right\}. \qquad (35)$$

In the case of circular orbits in the equatorial plane, the only nonvanishing component of the 3-velocity is given by v^{ϕ}. Now in the $3+1$ splitting formalism the 3-velocity for direct orbits (into which we will restrict our consideration in what follows), measured relative to the ZAMO observers has the following form

$${v_S}^{\phi} = \frac{1}{r\sqrt{\Delta}}\left(\left(r^3 + a^2r + 2Ma^2\right)\Omega - 2Ma\right). \qquad (36)$$

Substituting Ω into the above equation we end up with

$${v_S}^{\phi} = \frac{M^{1/2}(r^2 - 2aM^{1/2}r^{1/2} + a^2)}{\sqrt{r^2 - 2Mr + a^2}(r^{3/2} + aM^{1/2})} \qquad (37)$$



FIG. 4: Slicing 3-velocity (dashed line) and threading 3-velocity (solid line) of particels in circular motion in the equatorial plane of a Kerr (black) hole with $a = M/2$. Also shown are the velocities for the normalized radial coordinates corresponding to the marginally bound (r_{mb}) and marginally stable (r_{ms}) circular orbits

.

In the $1+3$ splitting formalism the 3-velocity (in direct orbits) measured relative to the fundamental observers at rest in the Kerr geometry has the form

$$v_T{}^{\phi} = \frac{(r^2 - 2Mr + a^2)^{1/2}}{\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{2Ma}{r}\Omega\right)}\Omega \tag{38}$$

again with substituting the Keplerian angular velocity measured by stationary observers at infinity, we have

$$v_T{}^{\phi} = \frac{(Mr^2 - 2M^2r + a^2M)^{1/2}}{(r^{3/2} + aM^{1/2})(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{2M^{3/2}a}{r^{5/2} + arM^{1/2}})} \tag{39}$$

Comparing equations equations (37) and (39), the following points are noteworthy:

I-As expected for $r \gg 1$ (or $\frac{M}{r}, \frac{a}{r} \ll 1$) , in both formalisms the 3-velocities reduce to the Newtonian value $v^{\phi} = r\frac{M^{1/2}}{r^{3/2} + aM^{1/2}} \equiv r\Omega$.

II-For $a = 0$ both reduce to the same 3-velocity $v^{\phi} = \frac{M^{1/2}}{(r-2m)^{1/2}}$ corresponding to the Schwarzschild case.

III-By equation (25) the two observers move relative to each other with the following linear velocity [11]

$$u_{TS} = \frac{2Mra\sin\theta}{\rho^2\Delta^{1/2}}|_{(\theta=\pi/2)} = \frac{2Ma}{r\Delta^{1/2}}. \tag{40}$$

In Fig. 4, the two 3-velocities as functions of the normalized radial coordinate ($\frac{r}{M}$) are depicted. In both formalisms the two 3-velocities of particles in circular orbits, approach the velocity of light on the photon circular orbit (r_{ph}) and tend to zero at infinity.

C. Kerr-NUT spacetime

Kerr-NUT spacetime is a stationary, axially symmetric solution of Einstein vacuum field equations with a the rotation parameter and n the NUT charge, also called magnetic mass. Both this parameters source the cross terms in the spacetime metric and it is naturally expected that they also contribute into the difference between the definitions of the two velocities discussed in the previous examples. This spacetime in the Schwarzschild-type coordinates has the following form

$$ds^2 = -\frac{\Delta}{p^2}(dt - Ad\phi)^2 + \frac{p^2}{\Delta}dr^2 + p^2 d\theta^2 + \frac{1}{p^2}\sin^2\theta(adt - Bd\phi)^2 \tag{41}$$

where

$$\Delta = r^2 - 2Mr + a^2 - n^2,\ p^2 = r^2 + (n + a\cos\theta)^2$$
$$B = r^2 + a^2 + n^2, \qquad A = a\sin^2\theta - 2n\cos\theta$$

In the equatorial plane $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$, the line element has the form

$$ds^2 = -\frac{r^2 - 2Mr - n^2}{r^2 + n^2}dt^2 - \frac{4a(Mr + n^2)}{r^2 + n^2}d\phi dt + \frac{B^2 - a^2\Delta}{r^2 + n^2}d\phi^2 + \frac{r^2 + n^2}{\Delta}dr^2. \tag{42}$$

Circular orbits in the equatorial plane in Kerr-NUT spacetime have been studied in [12]. The angular velocity of a test particle moving on the circular orbits around the symmetry axis and is observed by stationary observers at infinity is given by

$$\Omega = \frac{\sqrt{u^3\left[M\left(1 - n^2u^2\right) + 2n^2u\right]}}{1 + n^2u^2 \mp a\sqrt{u^3\left[M\left(1 - n^2u^2\right) + 2n^2u\right]}} \tag{43}$$

where $u = \frac{1}{r}$. This formula for $n = 0$ and $a = 0$ gives Keplerian angular velocities in the Kerr and NUT spacetimes respectively. These circular orbits exist only for the region $r > r_{ph}$, where r_{ph} is again the radius of the photon circular orbit but now given as the solution to the following equation [14]

$$r^3 - 3Mr^2 - 3n^2r \pm 2a\sqrt{r(Mr^2 + 2n^2r - Mn^2)} + Mn^2 = 0. \tag{44}$$



FIG. 5: Slicing 3-velocity (dashed line) and threading 3-velocity (solid line) of particles in circular motion in the equatorial plane of a Kerr-NUT spacetime with $a = M/2$ and $n = M/4$.

Substituting the components of metric (41) in the 3-velocity definitions in $1+3$ and $3+1$ splitting formalisms and employing the above formula for the angular coordinate velocity we have the following threading and slicing 3-velocities in the Kerr-NUT spacetime,

$$v_S^{\phi} = \frac{\mp\sqrt{u\left[M\left(1-n^2u^2\right)+2n^2u\right]}\left[1+(a^2+n^2)u^2\right]-2au^2(M+n^2u)}{\sqrt{1-2Mu+\left(a^2-n^2\right)u^2}\left[1+n^2u^2\mp a\sqrt{u^3\left[M\left(1-n^2u^2\right)+2n^2u\right]}\right]} \tag{45}$$

$$v_T^{\phi} = \frac{\left(r^2+n^2\right)\sqrt{r^2-2Mr+a^2-n^2}\left(\frac{\sqrt{u^3[M(1-n^2u^2)+2n^2u]}}{1+n^2u^2\mp a\sqrt{u^3[M(1-n^2u^2)+2n^2u]}}\right)}{\left[\left(r^2-2Mr-n^2\right)+2a\left(Mr+n^2\right)\left(\frac{\sqrt{u^3[M(1-n^2u^2)+2n^2u]}}{1+n^2u^2\mp a\sqrt{u^3[M(1-n^2u^2)+2n^2u]}}\right)\right]}. \tag{46}$$

By setting $a = 0$, we recover the results for the NUT spacetime in the equatorial plane, for which the threading and slicing 3-velocities are the same given by

$$v_S^{\phi} = v_T^{\phi} = \frac{\mp\sqrt{u\left[M\left(1-n^2u^2\right)+2n^2u\right]}}{\sqrt{1-2Mu-n^2u^2}}. \tag{47}$$

This is a direct consequence of the fact that the line element (41) for $a = 0$ and in the equatorial plane becomes a static line element, and as pointed out earlier, in this case the two formalisms (and the two observers) coincide, leading to the same velocity definition.

V. DISCUSSION

In the present study, we considered two different definitions of 3-velocity of a test particle moving on timelike curves in a *stationary spacetime*. These two 3-velocities are defined in the context of the two well known spacetime decomposition formalisms (namely threading and slicing) in terms of the metric components and the coordinate time velocity. In terms of observers they are defined relative to two different sets of observers, fundamental observers and Eulerian observers. The two sets of observers and their corresponding definitions of 3-velocities agree when the spacetime is static but differ when the spacetime is stationary having cross terms mixing space and time coordinates. Restricting our attention to the axially symmetric stationary spacetimes which are naturally adapted to the astrophysical phenomena related mainly to rotating sources such as pulsars and Kerr black holes, we compare the two velocities as functions of radial coordinate for test particles in circular orbits around the corresponding spacetime symmetry axis. By its definition velocity is an observer-dependent quantity, fundamental observers in the threading approach are at rest on constant world lines at fixed spatial coordinates, and hence they are non-inertial observers. These observers use the proper time read by clocks synchronized along the particle's world-line and employ the corresponding spatial line element dl_T to define the 3-velocity. In the case of Kerr metric these observers are called zero angular velocity observers (ZAVOs) and it is relative to these observers that the threading velocity of a test particle is defined.
In the ADM or slicing formalism, on the other hand, the 3-velocity is defined relative to the so called *fiducial observers* whose worldlines are orthogonal to the slicing hypersurfaces and so their definition depends on the chosen slicing. In the case of stationary axially symmetric spacetimes these observers are called *Eulerian observers* in analogy with fluid mechanics since, although dragged by the geometry, they are at rest on spatial slices. These observers are also non-inertial and due to the fact that their 4-velocity has a vanishing rotation (by their definition), are also called *locally non-rotating observers* [10]. In the case of Kerr metric the same observers are called *zero-angular-momentum observers* (ZAMOs) [13].
Now the main question is whether or not and in what context the 3-velocities defined relative to these two different sets of observers are comparable in astrophysical measurements? Obviously one can think of a physical situation in which a phenomena closely related to the rotational velocity of particles near massive rotating objects is being considered and

then compare the predictions based on the assignment of these two different velocities to the particles participating in the underlying phenomena. Interesting cases could be the phenomena related to the so called accretion disks around rotating black holes, in which matter swallowed by the black hole from its companion star forms a rotating disk around the black holes rotation axis. Another intersting example is the case of pulsars and related phenomena. In such cases due to the high rotational velocity of the black hole (pulsar) one should treat the underlying background as a Kerr spacetime and hence two different velocities could be assigned to the rotating matter in the accretion disk relative to two different sets of observers and consequently, in principle, there would be different predictions for the corresponding velocity-dependent phenomena. For example as shown in Fig. 4, for particles in circular motions with (normalized) radii between those corresponding to the *marginally bound* and *marginally stable* circular orbits the difference between the two velocities could be as large as %5 that of the velocity of light. These issues need a very careful consideration taking into account the relation between observations made by distant observers and those by fundamental and Eulerian observers and will be discussed elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

R. Gharechahi and M. Nouri-Zonoz thank University of Tehran for supporting this project under the grants provided by the research council. M.N-Z thanks the Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, University of Bern for kind hospitality and supporting his visit during which this study was carried out. M.N-Z also thanks Mathias Blau for useful discussions. Alireza Tavanfar thankfully acknowledges the support of his research by the Brazilian Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI-Brazil).

[1] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, W. H. Freeman and Company (1973).

[2] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifishitz, Classical theory of fields, 4th Edn. Pergamon press, Oxford (1975).

[3] A. Zelmanov, *Chronometric Invariants : On deformations and the curvature of accompanying space*, Dissertation, Translated from the Russian and edited by Dmitri Rabounski and Stephen J. Crothers, American Research Press, 2006.

[4] G. F. R. Ellis, R. Maartens and M. A. H. MacCallum, *Relativistic Cosmology*, Cambridge University Press (2011).

[5] D. Bini, C. Chicone, B. Mashhoon, Phys. Rev. **D** 85:104020, 2012.

[6] K. S. Thorne and D. Macdonald, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. 198, 339 (1982).

[7] E. Gourgoulhon, 3 + 1 formalism and bases of numerical relativity, arXiv preprint, gr-qc/0703035 (2007).

[8] W. Rindler, *Relativity: Special, General, and Cosmological*, Oxford University Press, 2006.

[9] B. Carter, Phys. Rev., **174**, 1559, 1968.

[10] J. M. Bardeen, W. H. Press and S. A. Teukolsky, The Astrophysical Journal, 178, 347-370 (1972).

[11] V. P. Frolov and I. D. Novikov, *Black Hole Physics*, Kluwer Academic Publishers (1998).

[12] C. Chakraborty, European Physical Journal C, 74(2) (2014) 1-12.

[13] M. A. Abramowicz and P. C. Fragile, Living Rev. Relativity 16.1 (2013).

[14] P. Pradhan, Class. Quantum Grav. 32 165001, 2015.

[15] It should be noted there are studies in which vacuum and non-vacuum solutions of GR are employed to model galactic dynamics.

[16] These observers are called Eulerian as they are at rest on *spatial slices* in the same way that in fluid mechanics the Eulerian observers are at rest in *space* and do not move with the fluid. To lift any ambiguities on the analogy made, it should be noted that in the case of axially symmetric stationary spacetimes these observers are comoving with the *spacetime fluid*, i.e dragged by it. In other words the analogy is about the observers and their relation to the underlying 3-space and does not extend to the two fluids.

[17] By the definitions of Eulerian observers and the lapse function it is obvious that the same quantity also accounts for the proper time between two hypersurface, i.e $d\tau = Ndt$.

[18] In the special case when the underlying spacetime is stationary and axially symmetric the local frames carried by these observers are also called *Locally Non-Rotating Frames* (LNRF)

[19] The minus sign could be traced back to the fact that for an Eulerian observer corotating with the test particle, the fundamental observer moves in the opposite sense.